

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARGIE CHERRY and ESTORIA CHERRY, on
behalf of themselves and all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
("City College") LAWRENCE WONG, in his
official capacity as President of the Board of
Trustees, MILTON MARKS, III, in his official
capacity as Vice-President of the Board of Trustees,
DR. NATALIE BERG, JOHNNIE CARTER, JR.,
DR. ANITA GRIER, JULIO J. RAMOS, RODEL
E. RODIS, in their official capacities as members
of the Board of Trustees, and DR. PHILIP R. RAY,
JR., in his official capacity as Chancellor,

Defendants.

No. C 04-04981 WHA

**PROTECTIVE ORDER RE
LIST OF CLASS MEMBERS**

The Court has (thus far) received three letters from potential class members objecting to the disclosure of their names and contact information to plaintiffs' counsel. The list of persons to whom the class notice was mailed has been redacted so the identities and contact information for these three individuals is not revealed. The Clerk shall file this redacted list of class members under seal and provide each side with a copy.

This list of potential class members contains confidential information for attorneys' eyes only. As such, it shall be used by counsel solely for the purposes of the above-captioned litigation and shall not be disclosed to or discussed with any person except: (1) counsel;

1 (2) necessary support personnel of counsel; (3) independent experts who are hired by counsel
2 and necessary support personnel for such persons; (4) a certified court reporter taking testimony
3 involving this confidential information. This list of class members and any notes regarding this
4 list shall be maintained in the custody and control of counsel in a manner that limits access to
5 the persons listed above. The Court will retain jurisdiction over disputes arising from any
6 alleged violations of this order for only 45 days after final termination of this action.

7 As previously observed, some of the class notices initially mailed by defendants'
8 counsel were returned as undeliverable. Counsel was able to find alternate addresses for (and
9 re-send the notice to) some of these individuals. If any recipient from the second round of
10 mailings objects to the disclosure of their confidential information after the date of this order,
11 plaintiffs' counsel will be notified and ordered to refrain from contacting that individual or
12 otherwise using that individual's data.

13 If the parties wish to set forth more elaborate conditions to further restrict the access to
14 or use of confidential information in this action, they shall meet and confer before submitting a
15 proposed protective order for the Court's review.

16
17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18
19 Dated: August 1, 2005



20 WILLIAM ALSUP
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28